G. R. S. 58]

Previous references.

File No. 31/13

1913.

Serial Nos. 1 4-5

Later references. (illegible)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 4-5

Part B for January 14

SUBJECT.

Honour of Addakkeleki and Punchakalaka to the Sirdar of Murgi Mutt.

Table of contents.

1. From Linga the Agent of the Murgi Mutt.
Petition of 14-7-13
Praying the reconsideration of the order re the withdrawal of the ~~order~~ honours of Addapalaki & Punchakalaka from a sannyasi by the Sirdar of the Murgi Mutt.

2. From the deputation of the Lingayit gentlemen representing the case of 14-7-13.

GPB—5,000—22 10 13

(illegible)

G.R.S. 11] 1913 - 14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Incr)

NOTES.

File No. 30/13-14

FILE HEADING.

Honors of Addapalki & Pancha Kalasa to the Swami of the Murgi matt.

From

Lingappa, Agent of the Murgi matt.

No. Petn Dated 14·7·13 Received 17·7·13.

Diary No. 179	Enclos. 1 book Spare Copies. -	Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Prays for the reconsideration of the order of Govt. regarding the withdrawal of the Honors of Addapalakki and Panchakalasa originally enjoyed by the Swami of the Murgi matt at Chitaldrug.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

A deputation of Lingayet gentlemen having waited upon the Dewan, and represented to him their case, he was pleased to send the accompanying note for the case being worked up, put through the council & a final note furnished for submn to His Highness.

P.T.O

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—35,000—15 6 12

Mur: F 30 of 13.14

The accompanying memorial presented to me by a deputation of the leading members of the Veerasaiva community, in regard to the grant of 'Addapalakki' and 'Panchakalasa' honours to the Swami of the Murgi Matt, together with a note on the arguments advanced by the deputation, is forwarded, with compliments, to the First Councillor for favour of his opinion and recommendations.

2. The case may kindly be put through the Council and a Final Note furnished for submission to His Highness.

15.7.13 RC

Mur:- Please let me have a note giving the history of the Controversy so far as Govt orders are concerned up to date. Early

16/7/13

17.7.13

Mur-F 30 913-14. 3

N O T E.

***

A deputation of the leading members of the Veerasaiva community in the Province consisting of 15 gentlemen, interviewed me to-day (14th July 1913) at 11.30 a.m. at the Public Offices, Bangalore, in connection with the question of granting the honours (insignia) of "Addapalaki" and "Panchakalasa" to the Swami of the Murgi Mutt, at Chitaldrug, the spiritual head of the Lingayet community.

2. Mr. H.K. Veerabasavaiya, F.A., B.L. Advocate, Bangalore, who formed one of the deputation, read the enclosed memorial which he presented to me on behalf of the deputation and discussed the various aspects of the question involved.

3. He argued -

(1) that the rahadaris of 1816 and 1869 granted to the Swami of the Murgi Mutt established conclusively that both these honours had been conceded to the Mutt in the past;

(2) that the announcement made by the Chief Commissioner Mr. Bowring and His Highness Maharaja Sir Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur in the year 1863 to the effect that the Sringeri Swami was the only Guru entitled to the use of Addapalakki, had practically been annulled by the Rahadari subsequently issued in 1869;

Inscr. 7 30 7/13·14 4

(3) that there was no dispute concerning these insignia between the period 1869-902 and that it was only in 1902 that the Brahmins sent up a protest for the first time against the use of "Addapalakki" by the Swamy of the Murgi Mutt.

(4) that "Panchakalasa" was not an insignia but only an adjunct to a palanquin;

(5) that without "Panchakalasa" no religious ceremony could be conducted among the members of the Veerasaiva community and that it was used even for removing their dead;

(6) that in the year 1827 His Highness Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur had given to the then Swami of the Murgi Mutt a new "Panchakalasa";

(7) that a subordinate mutt of the Murgi Mutt, viz., the Balehalli Mutt has been allowed this honour and the Swami of this Mutt is actually using "Panchakalasa" even now;

(8) that even to this day a Pollegar disciple of the Mutt goes in procession every year at Chitaldrug on a palanquin with "Panchakalasa";

(9) that the predecessor of the present Swami, though he stayed away at Byadgi for several years was visiting Chitaldrug every year during the Dasara festivities w he was going in procession in Chitaldrug both "Addapalakki" and "Panchakalasa"

Inter-7 30 J 13-14. 5

this fact may ~~even~~ now be ascertained both from the local public and the then Deputy Commissioner of the District; and

(10) that the Murgi Mutt is a very important LingayetMutt in India with disciples numbering 40 lakhs and possessing properties yielding a large income and that the Governments of Bombay and of the Native States in British India including Hyderabad, had permitted the use by the Swami of the "Addapallaki" and "Panchakalasa" when travelling within their jurisdiction.

3. In concluding, Mr. Veerabasavaiya requested that the honours in question which had been denied to the Mutt under the recent orders of Government might be restored. He added that what he was asking for was no new honours but only a continuance of the honours long enjoyed. He also represented that the Swami was anxious to tour throughout Mysore and encourage education among the members of his community within it, but that he was prevented from doing so as the honours legitimately due to his position had been denied to him.

4. I have promised to go through the papers, place the matter before His Highness and communicate His Highness' decision thereon.

15.7.13 RL

G 'R. S. 12]

7

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mor File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Hon'ble Councillor's order -

5. Please let me have a note giving the history of the controversy so far as the Govt. orders are concerned up to date - Early.

Sd - H.V.K. 16.7.13

6. In G.O. No. 1147-8/M.J. 57-02 Dated the 17th Nov. 08, the nomination of one Jagadeva Sastri of Benaresse to the Swamiship of the Mutt at Chitaldrug was recognised by Govt. While sanctioning this succession, Govt observed in the last para of that order that the stoppage of the ready money cash allowce of Rs 24-3-0 per month on account of the former Swami having proceeded in procession with certain prohibited insignia, would stand good until further orders.

7. The previous Swami of the mutt having used a Palakki & other vehicles without orders from Govt., Govt. directed in G.O. No. 979-83 Dt 2.11.03 that the ready money allowce should be stopped until further orders & called upon the Matt to submit a Sanad

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12

G R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mar. File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Explanation & apology for the same. This explanation & apology was submitted by the present Swm Jagadeva Vadi in his letter Regd. No. 270 & 17.7.05; and the Govt. accepted the apology & Expln offered that this predecessor might have used the prohibited insignia under the impression that they were being used by the matt & that he should not have done so without the express sanction of Govt., and directed in G. O. No. 1111 - 12/M.7. 57-02 dated the 28th August 1905 the monthly allowce being continued with Effect from the date of attachment & the Swm being warned against the use of all or any of the prohibited insignia without the final orders of Govt.

8. Then followed the agitation of the Mungi matt for the use of the addapalakki and Panchakalasa by the Swm of the matt.

9. Re addapalakki.

The Mungi matt relies on the Sanad issued by His Highness the Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wodeyar Bahadur III in 1816 and the Takeedaries issued about that time, and on the Takadari issued by the Chief Commissioner in 1869

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G.R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mur. File No. 30 of 1914-15

Serial No.

in which permission was granted to use Addapalakki and other special insignia. While submitting the case for the orders of His Highness the Maharaja in March 1906, Sir P.N. Krishnamurti K.C.I.E. the then Dewan of Mysore referred to these Sanads & Rahadaries, and also explained that the interruption caused in the enjoyment of these privileges by the Sringeri order of Sept. 1863, and the Ch: Court Mr. Bowring's remarks in his letter of the 29th July 1863 to the Govt. of India that the Sri Sringeri Swami was the only Guru in the State who was permitted to use the Addapalakki were to be reconciled with the presumption that at that time no one else but the Sri Sringeri Matt was in actual enjoyment of the privileges, as the Murugi matti claim had not then been disposed of.

10. The question was referred for the opinion of Mr. V.P. Madhava Rao who succeeded to the Dewanship shortly after.

11. Mr. Madhava Rao's Exhaustive note of submission to His Highness the Maharaja dated the 1st April 1907, paras 9 to 14:-

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mun. File No. 30 of 1913. 14

Serial No.

likes note of the Sannads of 1816 and the Rahadaries granted to the matt from time to time including that granted by the Chief Commr in 1869, and of the different points of view submitted by the members of the deputation & and recorded by the Dewan on pages 3 & 4 supra. Paras 10 and 13 of Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao's note enunciate the principle on which this Exceptional honour of Addapalakki has to be granted. His Highness the Maharaja was graciously pleased to pass the following Emphatic order "I quite concur with the Dewan in his "views, and have no hesitation in ruling "that the honour of Adda Palakki cannot be "given or continued, to either the Kudli-Sringeri "or the Murgi, or any other matt." &c.

12- Order No. 5547-50/M.T. 58 of 97 dt. 28. 8. 07 was thereupon issued declining to grant the honour of Addapalakki to Murgi & Kudli Sringeri matts, and allowing all the insignia (but this one) mentd in the Rahadari of 1869 to the Murgi matt. A fresh Rahadari was issued to the matt in accordance with this order on 29. 6. 07.

13- Re. Panchakalasa —

The manager of the Murgi matt in

*: Except probably the Sri Sringeri matt to which it has been allowed.

T H F

X H I.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mer File No. 30 of 1913—14

Serial No.

The case of Pancha Kalasa was also before Govt. in 1907–08, and the points adduced in favor of the matt by the members of the deputation now were all taken into consideration then when the question was decided against the matt. Pancha Kalasa is used by the Balehalli matt (Vide Page 10 of the notes on the Pancha Kalasa file) which the Murgi matt people say is a subordinate matt. It is not clear whether this matt is subordinate to the Murgi matt; at any rate there is nothing to show it. The notes also show that a new Pancha Kalasa was sent to the matt by His late Highness Sri Krishna Raja Wodeyar Bahadur in 1829. (Vide Mr. Puttanna Chetty's note - Page 28).

14. Mr. V. P. Madhava Rao's note of submission dated the 3rd April 1908 discusses the exact question of the grant of this insignia from the various standpoints brought to notice by the deputation, and gives reasons in favor of this should be considered as a special boon and should not be granted to the Murgi matt.

15. His Highness the Maharaja was graciously pleased to order thus—

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

G.-R. S. 12]

12

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mun File No. 30 of 1913 - 14

Serial No.

"I agree with the Dewan". and Govt passed order No. 5054-65/mun 7 57 902 dated the 18th may 1908 declining to grant this ~~ode~~ honor to the Durgi matt.

16. It is ~~explained~~ these two orders viz G.O No. 5547-58/mn 7. 58 of 97 & 28.5.07 and G.O. No. 5054-65/mn 7 57-02 & 18.5.08 that the disciples of the Durgi matt ask for a review.

17. G.O. no. 1219-26 & 16.9.08 reiterates the principle on which processions of Swamis are to be conducted & prescribes the submission of their programmes in each Taluk or District to the Amildar & Dy Coll. before the Swami enters the Taluk or District.

18. G.O. no. 450-9/mn 7. 65-08-9 dated the 12th Dec. 1908 allows the processions of the Swami of the Durgi matt in public streets without stoppage of music in front of Brahman & other temples, ~~and~~ the disciples of the matt to chant Vedas in such processions and to praise the Swami as "Jagadguru" provided that this term is not inscribed on Pandal & flags &c.

Submitted proceedings.

EG

29.7.13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

G'R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mem File No. 30 of 1913. 14

Serial No.

19 Subd & 18th Councillor

The memorialists pray for the restoration of the honours of Adda pallki and Panchakalasa to the Swamigalu of the Murgha Mutt. Both these matters were, after anxious consideration and full hearing, finally decided upon by Govt in their orders No 5547-58 - Mug 7. 58 of 1897 and no 5052-65 - Mug 7.57 of 1902 dated 28th may 1907 and 18th may 1902 respectively. In seeking to reopen the questions, the memorialists have not advanced any fresh argument or piece of evidence.

20. The Govt orders referred to above discuss at length the position taken for the Mutt and there is therefore no reason for submitting any elaborate note on the subject.

Sd
30.7.13

21. All the previous files are sent up.

2/8/13

Sd
6/8

22) Please attend above.

Sd
6/8

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPS—65,000—17-6-12.

(14

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Imp File No. 30 of 1913 - 14

Serial No.

43) All available files regarding the Mungi Matt are submitted herewith as directed.

5.8.13 Subs & 1st Councillor

63

5.8.13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPG—67,400—17-3-13.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Murgi Matha Claim

25 All the points now urged were considered before Government passed the order of 28th May 1907. Kudli Matha and Murgi Matha had both claimed Adda palki and both had some old Sannads and documents in support of their claim. But both the claims were deliberately rejected. The following paragraphs explain the reasons for arriving at the decision.

(i) " 11. More than all, it has to be considered " whether it is desirable or expedient to permit the " enjoyment of such a special honour as the Adda Palki " by more than one person. The honour is one pertaining " to Royalty, and the grant of such a high distinction " to any but a Matt holding the highest rank among the " different Matts does not seem to be desirable. The " Government therefore consider it inexpedient to per- " mit the resuscitation of the honours and privileges " which have ceased to be enjoyed by the Kudli-Sringeri " Matt for many years past, i.e.,from 1850-51.

(ii) "12. The grant of such high honours being "a distinct prerogative of the ruling authority, His "Highness the Maharaja is pleased to rule that, not- "withstanding any documents or sannads that may be pro- "duced by the parties, it is His Highness's policy and "wish that the right to the honour of Adda Palki shall "be continued only to the Guru of the Sringeri Matt at "Sringeri, and cannot be given or continued to either "the Kudli Sringeri or any other Matt."

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

26) That the honour passee unchallenged in British India is not of much importance, because the principles guiding this State are very different. Nor can the practice of other Native States, some of them minor states, affect the case here. It may be remarked that some of the orders passed elsewhere are based on what was represented as the practice of Mysore, though in the latter place, the exercise had long been either prohibited or allowed to fall into desuetude. The nirupa of 1816 on which the claim is based recites that Adda Palki was mamul and does not give the honour as a Royal grant. The order cited already observes as follows about the extent to which such grants can be claimed to be in force at present.

27) " His Highness the Maharaja Krishnaraja " Wadeyar III who appears to have been very liberal " with the grant of these honours in the earlier part " of his reign had evidently in later years thought " that they should be restricted to the one important " and leading matt of Sringeri. The remark made by " Mr. Bowring in his letter dated 29 July 1868 " addressed to the Government of India, Foreign Depart " -ment, to the effect that the Sri Sringeri Swamy " 'is the only Guru in the Province who is permitted " to use the Adda Palki or cross-palanquin' is in " consonance with the Maharaja's declaration made in " 1863 and shows the highest authorities in Mysore " considered that the Guru of the Sringeri Matt was

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Serial No

" the only personage entitled to hold that honour.""

251 Pancha Kalasa has not been mentioned in the old documents produced as due to this Matha. All the facts and arguments now urged have already been considered and the following remarks were made in Mr. Madhava Rao's note submitted to His Highness on 3rd April 1908.

" I however think that we have gone much further already than perhaps is desirable in reviving " as an act of grace on the part of the sovereign " authority in the state, honours to these matts in " regard to which, although the authority of Gannads ", and Shaha Amals may be set up, the practice has been " quite against their use. I am not sure that His " Highness the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar " Bahadur III, if alive, would have permitted their " revival or grant. His Highness the present Maharaj " has been exceptionally gracious to those Matts in " giving them the honours specified in the Government " Proceedings of 28th May 1907. I would recommend " strict adherence to the orders then passed. Any " deviation from them will land the Government in " interminable complaints and disputes. I am today " sending up an endorsement to the Kudli- Sringeri " Mutt, who want to agitate the question of Adda- " palki, telling them that the orders of 26th May " cannot be reopened. I would recommend a similar re " -ply being given to the Murgi Mutt about the Pancha "Kalasa. This is a royal insignia and it is referred to in the compilation made in the Secretariat as a special

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12

Serial No.

" Birudu granted to certain Mutts. I do not believe
" that it has anything to do with the five Achars.
" Even if it did, it is not desirable that an honour
" not specifically mentioned in the Rahadari of 1869
" should now be bestowed for the first time under the
" orders of His Highness. There is always safety in
" adhering to mamul in these religious and sectarian
"disputes and as I submitted above, I am not sure that
" we have not gone even beyond the limit of safety
" in overriding mamul and conferring special honours
" on these mutts in the exercise of one of the prero-
" gatives of royalty. "

30) His Highness agreed with this view and an order was passed, in the following terms.

31) " As regards the Pancha Kalasa however,
"this is a royal insignia and it is referred to in the
" compilation made in the Secretariat as a special
" Birudu granted only to certain Matts. The Govern-
"ment are not inclined to believe that it has anything
" to do with the five Achars. Even if it did, it has
"not been specifically mentioned in the Rahadari of
" 1869. Further, mamul is a safer guide in deciding
" questions connected with religious and sectarian
" disputes than the oral evidence offered by the
" contending parties or entries in the old sannads
" and Government records. In these circumstances the
" Government of His Highness the Maharaja direct that
" it is not desirable that the pancha kalasa honour
" claimed by the Murgi Matt which is not specifically
"mentioned in the rahadari of 1869, should now be

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—1-6 12

Serial No.

" bestowed for the first time. "

82) The order of His Highness on the case about Addapalki is in the following emphatic terms.

83) " I quite concur with the Dewan in his view " and have no hesitation in ruling that the honour of "the Adda Palki cannot be given or continurd to " either the Kudli Sringeri or the Purgi or any other " Matt. The two above named Matts may, therefore, " be informed accordingly now. "

84) I venture to think that any further discussion is at this stage unnecessary, unless at the express direction of His Highness that the questions may be considered again.

Dewan 11/8/13

35) P.S. In connection with this, I may refer to my Note d. 29.8.9 (File 801 - 08), to show that even the order of 1907 in favour of this Mathas was considered by other ~~Sections~~ Sections of the Community as going too far.

11/8/13

4661
Read 18-8-13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-7-12.

R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Honours to Murgi Matt

36) Among other matters, the deputation urged that a subordinate matt of the Murgi matt, viz., the Balehalli matt, had been allowed the use of 'Pancha Kalas' and that the Swami of this matt was actually using it even now.

37) The papers do not shew, however, why this anomaly, if it is one, has been allowed to be perpetuated.

38) I shall be glad if this matter is also noted upon.

19.8.13. RB

39) Please continue note. There does not appear to be anything in the record to show that the Balehalli Matt is subordinate to the Murgi Matt. Do there any references available in the office on this question

RB
21.8.13

40) There are no references available in the office on the question of the Balehalli matt being subordinate to the Murgi matt. This subject has been touched upon in para 13 page 11 supra.

41) Kind attention is also invited to page 18 of the Pancha Kalasa file No. 5/1992

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G I P—65,000—17-6-12.

. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 30 of 1913 76

Serial No.

Where the 8 matts which are enjoying the privilege of using Pouchakalasa are mentioned. The Balehalli matt is one of these matts. The late Marrai Secretary would Evidently have referred to this matter if the Balehalli matt was subordinate to the Mungi matt.

42) Third reference is also invited to the then ~~Hon'ble~~ Councillor Mr. K. P. Puttanna chetty's Note dated 3rd Feb. 1908 pages 25 to 29 in the same file. While ~~writing~~ strongly in favor of the Mungi matt Swami using this insignia, he, (as a disinterested gentleman ~~acted~~ who is most likely to know the positions of the several dingaya matts in relation to one another) would not Evidently have lost sight of the fact that the Balehalli matt was subordinate to the Mungi matt, if that was a fact at all, Especially when it was pointed out in the previous pages that the former matt was using an insignia which was denied to the latter.

43) It is also a noteworthy fact that the Mungi matt did not raise this question of subordination of the Balehalli matt ~~was~~ in 1908 when ~~this~~ it agitated for the grant of this honor, such an important fact

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G I E—65,000—17-6-12

7. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 30 of 1913 7 C/

Serial No.

would not have been proposed by the Muruji matt in the first instance.

(44) It is also respectfully submitted that in the matter of insignia & honors that the several matthas enjoy, the question of subordination & superiority does not arise. Each matt, however humble or great, stands on its own dignity and is quite independent of other matts. The ~~[illegible]~~ matts are honored by the Sovereign in proportion to the greatness attained to by the Presiding High Priests for the time being. The accession to the matts however small or insignificant has to be sanctioned by His Highness the Maharaja, and the affairs of the matts are looked to, in case of difficulty, by Govt quite independently of other matts.

(45) So, in absence of definite evidence, the Balehalli matt cannot probably be considered as subordinate to the Muruji or any other matt.

Subt for orders.
BL
21.8.13

(46) Subt to the Dewan through the 1st Councillor.

(47) I have detained the file

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GIP—65,000—17-C-12.

Serial No.

for some days with a view to trace any papers that may throw some light upon the subordination of the Balchalli Mutt to the Munji Mutt. There is absolutely nothing to show that such is the case. It is also significant that no allegation to this effect has been made in the previous discussion or for that matter in the printed petition now submitted.

(2) On my questioning the agent of the Munji Mutt as regards the support he had for this allegation, he produced a copy of a Nirup dated 4th Nov. 1830 wherein recognition was given to the supreme authority of the Munji Mutt in matters affecting the conduct of ~~Sivachars~~ Sivachars. He was not able to produce however any definite finding from a competent public authority of the actual subordinate status of the Balchalli Mutt relating to the management of the Mutt or regulating the succession to the 'Peeta'.

(4) Even as regards the Nirup it is arguable that the incident referred to therein shows that the

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—6°,000—7-6-12.

Serial No

Balakalai Mutt's action was independently and actually adverse to the Muzai Mutt a position which a subordinate Mutt owning allegiance to its superior Mutt can scarcely be expected to take. Further it is a matter for consideration how far a Kirup of the kind can be accepted as conclusive evidence of an existing state of things at the time.

5. Considering all the circumstances in the case, there appears to be little doubt that in the matter of priestly prestige Muzai Mutt is at least equal to and perhaps a little superior to the Balakalai Mutt but there is no question of ~~natural~~ subordination and overlordship between them. Each has to stand upon its own legal grounds for its honours. If Balakalai Mutt has been granted the honour of Pancha Kalasa, it is no argument that all other Mutts of equal or superior status to it should enjoy the same privilege. Among the Vaishnava Mutts, the Vyasaraya Mutt is the only one enjoying the privilege

NOTE Contn sheet.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Inam File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Uttaradi and Raghavendraswamy Mutts are it equal and the former is actually treated more favourably by Govt as regards Reception and Bikshe

(1) The fact that a Rayar disciple of the Mutt goes in procession in a palanquin with Panchakalasa is even less satisfactory as an argument. It needs no saying that if such a person uses the Panchakalasa, it is not as a disciple of the Mutt he is doing so but as a Rayar descendant.

Sec
1.9.13

(2) Please ask the Dy C= Kadur confidentially to ascertain if Balehalli admits this Claim.

Early 7/9/13

Dy C
8/9

(3) Issue the draft put up

Sec
3.9.13

2. Petn 1.9.13 from Linjappa, agent, Mungi matt. Submits certain papers & shows that the Balehalli & other Linjayats make

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—7-6-12.

?10

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mur File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

are subordinate to the Murgi matt.

3. To the Dy Com^r Kadur Dt. Conf^l. D.O. No. 503 of 3.9.13 Enquiries if the claim of the Murgi matt for Superiority over the Bukkahalli matt is admitted by the latter matt.

4. Petn from Mr H.K. Veerabasaviah, Advocate dy 5.9.13 Refers to certain papers & books for showing that the Murgi matt is superior to the Bukkahalli matt.

Encls to S. No 2 -

(54) 1) a copy of a Mahratta extract from un-authenticated original, furnished by the Vern: records office.

2) A printed copy of a Minute, said to be issued by His Highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishna-Rayendra Wadeyar Bahadur dy 4-Oct 1830.

(55) Encls to S. No 4

1) a copy of a Kanarese extract from un authenticated original Kaka annal diary of 1822. -

2) a copy of a Mahratta minute ~~paraka~~

3) a Kan: transliteration of the above.

(56) Mr Veerabasaviah also refers to

1) Census Report of 1901 - Page 534

2) Bombay Gazetteer of 1882.

3) Mysore Gazetteer by the office.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-13.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mem File No. 30 of 1913-4

Serial No

Subd to 1st Councillor

Mr. Veerabasaviah has also submitted a few documents and has invited reference to certain published reports on the question of the subordination of the Balepalli mutt to the Murgi Mutt

The Dt Govt of Kadur who was requested to make confidential enquiry in the matter, has forwarded a statement from the Swamiji himself emphatically denying the subordination of his mutt to the Murgi Mutt and advancing for his mutt the authority of the founder of the said Firm the copy of the Nirup produced by this Swamy and the copies produced by Murgi Mutt apart. It may be inferred that there were disputes of precedence between these Mutts. In any case it would be invidious and altogether uncalled for, for the Govt to enter upon an enquiry into the claim of superiority advanced by Murgi Mutt. It is always the safest and perhaps the wisest course to treat these foundations as independent unless there is very clear evidence to the contrary

lea
17.9

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—'7-6-12.

47

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Mur File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

59) Mr. Varadasavayya with four or five other representative Swachar gentlemen of Bangalore saw me 3 or 4 days ago again on this matter. He referred to the reasons already set forth in the petitions & enclosures.

60) As I expected, the Balehalli Guru does not admit the cogency of the ~~agt~~ argument set up on behalf of the Panchakalasa claim, which must be decided on its independent merits.

19/9/13

20/9

Submitted to the Dewan with reference to his orders at para 36-3 of the Note

23.9.13

57448
23.9.13.

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB—65,000—7-9-12.

General and Revenue Secretariat. File No. 30 of 191 .

Serial No.	
5	From Lt. Dy. Comm'r. Kabul D.O. Camp No 1 dt 15 9 13 Reports re the Mungi Incl.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

C.—R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. of 191

29

Serial No.

TANK VIEW,
YELWAL ROAD,
MYSORE.
25th June 1913.

29

No 694
Sn 1

My dear Sir,

I submit herewith, for his Highness' information and favour of return, a D.O. letter - received from His Highness the Maharaja of - - Kolhapur in regard to the Muraga Rajendrasvami Mutt of Chitaldrug.

Perhaps, the representatives may - - also come to you. The case will be worked up and submitted in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Mirza M. Ismail, Esq., B.A.,
Offg. Huzur Secretary to
H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
M y s o r e.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-3-15.

From Reg. No. 539

(3)

Kolhapur,

5th June 1913.

My dear Mr. Vishweshvaraya,

You might be aware that there is a Math of His Holiness the Jagadguru Muragha Rajendra Swami at Chitaldrug in your State. I am told that is the highest and most ancient Math of the Lingayets having spiritual jurisdiction over the whole Lingayet community in India.

The present incumbent of the holy seat is said to be a renowned Sanskrit scholar and takes great interest in the education of all backward classes wothout distinction of caste or creed. I gather from documents shown to me (specially from a Sanad granted to the Math by the grandfather of His Highness the Maharaja Saheb of Mysore) that this Math is entitled from time immemorial to all the honours due to the Shringeri Math. The Swami has been duly honoured by the Government of Bombay and the Native States by being allowed the use of all the usual insignia including the adda-palaki (cross-palanquin), panchalakasha &c. I also understand that the grand-father of His Highness the present Maharajasaheb of Mysore was pleased to invite the Swami of this Math to his palace and accorded him all honours due to his sacred position. Even the Brahmin States, such as Sangli, Miraj, Aundh &c. duly respected the Swami by recognizing his right to the use of the usual insignia (adda-palaki, pancha-kalasha, shwetachhatri &c.) I also learn that the Nizam State has similarly recognised the right of the Swami to the use of the usual insignia. In my State also the Swami has been simi larly honoured.

In my recent interview with the Swami I learnt that owing to some misunderstanding there was an idea that the use of the cross-palamquin and pancha-kalasha is prohibited in the Mysore State to the Swami.

This has put His Holiness to great difficulty as it has come in the way of his tour in the Mysore District. I should be very pleased if you could kindly go through the papers and bring to His Highness' notice the facts of the case.

I am greatly pleased to learn that you are the present Dewan of Mysore and would congrtulate His Highness on the selection made.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- Shahu Chhatrapati.

" C O P Y "

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Murzi Madd honors.

Before submitting the case for His Highness's orders, the draft submission note prepared under my instructions and the connected papers may be forwarded to the Second Councillor also for favour of his opinion.

If he concurs, the draft may be approved with such suggestions or alterations as he may wish to make.

23/10/13

2nd Counr

23/10

I agree with the first councillor in thinking that the case cannot be re-opened for consideration on its merits unless at the express desire of His Highness. As the Dewan's note seeks such permission, I have nothing more to add a report thereto.

27/10/13

Dewan

27/10

29.10

5848
29.10.13

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Memorial from the disciples of the Murgi Mutt praying for the restoration of the honours of Adda Palakki and Pancha Kalasa to their Swami.

Returned with D.O.No. 291 dated 8.12.13.

Order.

Submitted to His Highness.

These papers relate to a memorial from the disciples of the Murgi Mutt praying for the restoration of the honours of Adda Palakki and Pancha Kalasa to the Swami of that Mutt.

2. A deputation comprising of the leading gentlemen of the Veerasaiva community also interviewed me at the Public offices, Bangalore, on the 14th July 1913, and Mr.H.K.Veerabasavayya B.A.,B.L., Advocate, argued the case on their behalf. Mr.Veerabasavayya's arguments are contained in my note dated 15th July 1913.

B.

3. The question of the grant of Adda Palakki and Pancha Kalasa honours to this Mutt was, after full consideration, decided by Government in their orders Nos 5547-58/Muz F.58-1897 and 5054-65/Muz F. 57-1902 dated 28th May 1907 and 18th May 1908, respectively, and the grant of these honours to the Swami of the Murgi Mutt was declined under His Highness's orders.

4. The First Councillor, whom I have consulted in regard to the present memorial, thinks, for the reasons given in his note dated 11th August 1913 (pages 15 to 19 of the office notes), "that any further discussion is at this stage unnecessary unless at the express direction of His Highness that the questions may be reconsidered again".

5. As, however, one of the points urged by the deputation, viz., that the Balehalli Mutt, a subordinate Mutt of the Murgi Mutt, has been allowed the use of Pancha Kalasa, had not been dealt with in the notes, I called for information on this point also. Mr.Veerabasavayya, on behalf of the Murgi Mutt, has, in his petition dated 5th

35

J

September 1913 to the Muzrai Superintendent, referred to certain documents and published reports in proof of the fact that the Murgi Mutt is superior to the Balehalli Mutt. On the other hand, the Swami of the Balehalli Mutt whose statement has been obtained through the Deputy Commissioner of Kadur, denies the subordination of his Mutt to the Murgi Mutt.

13.

6. The First Councillor, in returning the papers to me, states that, as expected, the Balehalli Guru does not admit the cogency of the argument set up on behalf of the Pancha Kalasa claim which must be decided on its independent merits.

Page 28 of Office Notes

7. In view of the fact that the case has already received the fullest consideration, I somewhat hesitate to reopen the matter or reconsider the merits of the case without an express direction of His Highness to do so. I may mention however that another deputation of the leading representatives of this Mutt saw me again on the 25th September , and Mr.Veerabasavayya further argued the case laying stress upon the fact that the Murgi Mutt was decidedly superior in all respects to Balehalli Mutt.

8. I have also gone through the papers connected with this case and given the matter my best consideration. In view of the fact that the Swami of the Murgi Mutt is the spiritual head of the Lingayet community over a very large area, both in Mysore and the Bombay Presidency, I think the matter requires further consideration. The Second Councillor whom I have consulted, agrees with the First Councillor in thinking that the case cannot be reopened for consideration on its merits, unless at the express direction of His Highness.

Page 32 of Notes

9. I may add that His Highness the Maharaja of Kolhapur had also written to me in regard to the use of these honours by the Swami of the Durgi Mutt, and his D.O. dated 5th June 1913 was submitted for His Highness's information with my D.O.No. 694 dated 25th idem.

10. With these remarks, I submit the papers for His Highness's information and orders. If His Highness is in favour of reopening the question, I shall consider the matter in Council and resubmit the case for orders. Otherwise, the present memorial may be rejected.

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.	File No.	of 191
	Serial No.	

D. O. No. 7936

The Palace, Bangalore,
8th December 1913.

DO No 291
Wills, file
Secretary
Please put up draft reply
8/12/13

My dear Sir,

I am directed to return your submission Note No.1871 dated 27th November 1913 with the connected File and to say that His Highness is averse to reopening the question of honours for the Kurgi Mutt.

The whole question was carefully considered in 1908 and His Highness feels very strongly that there should be a finality in the orders of Government passed in cases of this kind.

Yours sincerely,

To,

M.Visvesvaraya Esq., C.I.E.,
Dewan of Mysore,
Bangalore.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-3-12

C R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 30 of 1913-14

Serial No.

Draft endorsement & the despatches of the Munshi matter subd. for approval.

12.12.13

Subd to Hon. Councillor

for

13.12.13

Draft appd by Hon Councillor

14 12 13

for

Subd to Dewan

for 15/12.

6632

15.12.13

Draft approved by Dewan

20.1.14

for

6 To Mr. H.K. Veera Basaviah

No. 1842 dt 22.1.14 Informs that the Govt. consider it inexpedient to re-open the question.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—65,000—17-6-12.

DIARY No. 179

1913-1914
SECTION Municipal
FILE No. 30 - 13
SERIAL No. 1

Petn from no 1087
14-7-1913.

TO

M. VISWESWARIAH, Esq., C.I.E.

DEWAN OF MYSORE,

BANGALORE.

MOST HONOURED SIR,

THE humble memorial of the leading members of Veerasaiva community in the several parts of the province respectfully sheweth.

(1) That the undersigned Memorialists are all disciples of Sri Jagadguru Muragha Rajendra Swami of Chitaldrug, who is the spiritual head of the Lingayet community in the whole of India. The Mutt has under its control and enjoyment thousands of Mutts scattered all over India having villages and Tasadiks yielding an annual income of over a lakh of rupees. Besides the Mutt enjoys directly under its control several Inam Villages in British India.

(2) That the Mutt in question was held in high esteem and respect being regarded as one of the very few important and privileged Mutts in the reign of H. H. Sri Krishnaraja Wodayar Bahadur III, besides the high honour and reverence shown in time past by several Maharajas and Kings including the Mogal Emperor at Delhi. The present Swami of the Mutt is a learned Sanskrit Scholar with enlightened and liberal views. He is well known for his great patronage towards English and Sanskrit Education without distinction of caste or creed, and takes much interest in social and material advancement of the community.

(3) That from time immemorial the Swamigalu of the Mutt have been enjoying all the special honours and privileges such as the use of the Addapalaki (cross palanquin) Swetachatri with Panchakalasa, Makaratorana etc., when going on tour among his disciples. This uninterrupted use and enjoyment of the privilege was never questioned till very lately in 1907, when for the first time the use of the cross palanquin only was put a stop to even though the genuineness of Sannads and other records showing the enjoyment by the Mutt of this privilege was fully conceded by the Government.

Vide 5547-58—Muz. F 58 of 1897, dated Bangalore 28th May 1907.

(4) That while depriving the Mutt of its right to cross palanquin the Government have so interpreted the plain language of the Rithadaries of 1869 and 1907 as even to prohibit the use of Pancha kalasa which is after all only a necessary and ordinary adjunct to any palanquin and which is generally used by even the most humble disciple of the Mutt.

The Memorialists humbly submit that a comparison of the old Sannads and records with the Proceedings of 1907, and other later records, will at once bear out that the treatment accorded to the Mutt is unfortunately not in consonance

2—

with the dignity to which it is by mamool entitled. The old records during the time of H. H The Krishnaraja Wodayar Bahadur III, and of the English Commission point out unmistakably, that the Swamigalu of the Mutt was entitled to, and enjoyed all the honours, and privileges to which the Sri Swamigalu of Sringeri Mutt is entitled.

(5) That before the Rahudari of 1907 was received a prolonged and minute enquiry was made regarding the privileges to which the Mutt was entitled and Sir. P. N. Krishnamurthy, K C. I. E,, the then Dewan of Mysore was impressed with the justice of our claim and assured that he would recommend to H. H. the Maharaja the granting of all the insignia including the cross-palanquin.

(6) That the Memorialists humbly submit that the present Swami Sri Jagadguru Jayadeva Murugharajendra Swamigalu, has been granted all the insignia including the cross-palanquin with Panchakalasa by the Government of Bombay during His Holiness' tour in Dharwar, Belgaum, Bijapur, Sholapur, Poona, Satara, North Canara and also by the Brahman States of Sangli, Miraj, Oundh and in the territories of H H. the Nizam of Hyderabad and of H.H. the Maharaja of Kolhapur. Further the District Magistrate of Coorg has also been pleased to recognise the right of the Mutt with all the insignia (*vide Appended booklet.*)

(7) That owing to the Mutt having been deprived of the honours of cross Palanquin, and Panchakalasa which were being enjoyed by the Mutt from time out of mind the Swamigalu naturally felt himself highly aggrieved and left the province to the great grief of all his disciples and is at present touring in the Bombay Presidency, where he intends permanently settling down.

(8) Therefore the Memorialists humbly pray that your Excellency may kindly be pleased to recommend to H. H. the Maharaja Saheb Bahadur to restore to the Mutt the honours of Addapalki and Panchakalasa, to which it was legitimately entitled and thereby allay the fears of the Memorialists. That the central seat of this Mutt being located in this province, the members of the Lingayet community both here and outside alike feel highly aggrieved on account of the great dishonour shown to their Chief Guru by depriving him of all the important insignia *viz.*, the cross Palanquin with Panchakalasa. By revival of this honour not only the devotees of the Mutt who are the subjects of H. H. the Maharaja in this province feel themselves rejoiced but also the Lingayets in British India will feel themselves honoured.

(9) Our community is most loyal to the throne and person of His Highness and we approach with this prayer that H. H. the Maharaja may be pleased to reconsider the matter and grant our humble request for which act of graciousness we shall in duty bound ever pray.

H. K. Veerabasaviah

Dated, 14 day of July 1913
BANGALORE.

DIARY No. 558

1913-1914

TOON Mur

FILE No. 30-13

SERIAL No. 24

4

5

ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜವಡೆಯರವರು

ವಿಕೃತಿಸಂವತ್ಸರದ ಆಶ್ವೀಜಬಹುಳ ೨ ಸೋಮವಾರದಲ್ಲು ಶ್ರೀಮತು ॥ ॥ ಅರಮನೆ ಶೀಮೆಗಡಿಗಳ ಫವುಜುದಾರ್, ಅಮಲ್‌ದಾರ್, ಕಿಲ್ಲೇದಾರ್ ವಗೈರೇರಿಗೆ ಬರಶಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ

ಚಿತ್ರದುರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಚೆನ್ನಾಲಾದ್ರಿ ಪ್ರಭು ಶೂನ್ಯ ಸಿಂಹಾಸನ ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ನಿರಂಜನ ಜಗದ್ಗುರು ಮುರಿಗಾರಾಜೇಂದ್ರಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರು ಬಾಣಾವಾರದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಲಪ ಕಟ್ಟೆ ನಂಜಾ ಎಂಬುವನಿಗೆ ಬಹಿಷ್ಕಾರ ಹಾಕಿ ಇರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಳೇ ಹಳ್ಳಿ ಮಠದವರು ಶುದ್ಧಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಸ್ಥಳ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಜಾವುಂಟಾಗಿ ಇರುವುವಲ್ಲದೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಠಕ್ಕೆ ತುಂಬಾ ಅಗೌರವವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಈಮಠದ ಚರಂತಿಜಡೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆಬಂದು ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಟ್ಟೇಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದೀತು.

ಬಾಳೆಹಳ್ಳಿ ಉಜ್ಜಯಿನಿ-ರಂಭಾಪುರಿ ಈ ಮೂರು ಪೀಠಗಳವರು ಬಹಿಷ್ಕಾರಹಾಕುವಲ್ಲಿ ತೆಗೆಯುವ ಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮುರಿಗಾರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಳವರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಶಿವಾಯಿ ನಡಿಯಕೂಡದೆಂದು ಪೂರ್ವಾಪರಭ್ಯಾದಿಂ ದಲೂ ಮಾಮೂಲಾಗಿ ನಡೆದು ಬಂದು ಇರುವಲ್ಲಿ ಬಾಳೆಹಳ್ಳಿ ಮಠದವರು ಶುದ್ಧಪತ್ರಿಕೆಕೊಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನು. ಆತಾಲ್ಲೋಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹರದೊ ಇಲಾಖೆಯವರು ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಅದನ್ನ ವಜಾನೂ ಡಿ ಶ್ರೀಮುರಿಗಾ ರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರ ಬಹಿಷ್ಕಾರದಂತೆ ನಡಿಯಬೇಕೆಂದ ಸ್ಥಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾಜನ ಗಳಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಬಂದೋಬಸ್ತು ಇಡಿಸುವದಲ್ಲದೆ ಶ್ರೀಮುರಿಗಾ ರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವ ರು ಅರಮನೆ ಶೀಮೆಗಡಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪಡುವಳ, ಗುರುಸ್ಥಳ, ಮಠತುಹಂತು, ಆ ಚಾರ್ಯ ಅಮ್ಯು ಗಳು, ಅಷ್ಟಾವರ್ಣಸಂಚಾಚಾರ ಯುಕ್ತರಾದ ಶಿವಭಕ್ತರು ಮುಂತಾದ ದರೊ ಬಸ್ತು ಶಿವಾಚಾರ ದರ್ಶನಾಚಾರ ಮುಂತಾದ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪುನೆಪ್ಪು, ಆಚಾರ, ವ್ಯವಹಾರ, ಬಹಿಷ್ಕಾರ ಮುಂತಾದ ಹರ ಯೇಕಬಾಬುಗಳು ವಿಚಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಕಾಣಿಕೆ ಕಪ್ಪತೆಗದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವದರಲ್ಲಿ ಲೇಶವೂ ಒಡ್ಡಿಮಾಡದಂ ತೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾಜನಗಳಿಗೂ ಖೂಬತಗಯೂದು ಇಡಿಸುವದು ಈ ಬ್ಯಾಪುಸಹಾ ದರುಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಹುಜೂ ರು ಯೆತರಾಜಿಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾದೀತೆಂದು ಯೆಲ್ಲಾಜನಗಳಿಗೂ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಹುಜೂರಿಗೆ ಶೃತಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದಿದೆ.

ಬ ತಾರೀಕು ೪ ನೆ ಮಾಹೆ ಅಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ ಸ ೧೮೭೦ ನೆ ಯಿಸವಿ ಮಿತ್ತ ಪ್ರಸನ್ನಯ್ಯ, ಮುನ ಷಿ, ಹುಜೂರು.

4-10-30

ಶ್ರೀಕೃಷ್ಣಾಎಂದು ಸೈನಾಗಿದೆ.

R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

D.O. No. 803
Dt. 3-9-13.
6

Confd
Mr. P. 30-13—3

To

The Dt. Comr. Kadur Dt.

My dear Mr. Krishna Rv.,

The question of the right of the Murgi Mutt at Chitaldrug to parade certain militias and among them Panchakalasa is again before Govt. ~~Said it was~~ represented on behalf of the Murgi Mutt that Panchakalasa was being allowed to the parade by the Balekalai Mutt which is a subordinate Mutt of the Murgi Mutt and for this reason the above order is sought. The record is required

This claim was rejected by G.O. No 5054-65-Mis. dated 18th May 1905. It is now

I am directed to request you to go as to ascertain confidentially if this claim is still

7

Yours Balchandani Mills. a very early reply is requested in the matter

Yours Sincerely

Lea

31/5/13

GPB—15,000—18-11-11

No. 524
30/3/14
Muzrai
30-13.
4

To

G. Aravamudam Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Muzrai Superintendent,

General & Revenue Department,

Muzrai Branch,

B a n g a l o r e.

In the matter of the memorial presented to the Dewan by the leading Lingayat citizens in the Mysore Province regarding certain insignia to Jagadguru Murugharajandra Swamy Mutt.

The undersigned prays that the following records may kindly be referred in order to show that Sri Murugharajandra Swamy Mutt at Chitaldrug is superior to the Mutt at Balehonnur.

I. Mysore Census Report 1901, page 534.

II. Bombay Gazetteer of 1884 in the chapter relating Dharwar.

III. Mysore Gazetteer by Mr. Rice.

IV. Nirup issued by Sri Mummadi Krishnarajandra Wodayar Bahadur to all Foujdars, Amildars, Killedars etc; dated 4th October 1830, already produced.

V. Extract from Huzur Shaha Ammal Dairy dated Magha Bahula 30, of Vishu, Thursday in the year 1822, filed herewith in connection with the Mutt at Ujjaini in Bellary District which is a mutt exercising co-ordinate jurisdiction with the Mutt at Balehonnur and of equal status with the latter.

VI. Another order of the same date in connection with the same subject herewith filed.

Besides the above there are a number of letters Addressed

9

to Chitaldrug Mutt from swamies of Balehonnur, Ujjaini, and Srisaila and also a judgement of the Bombay High Court confirming the judgement of the Sub Judge at Havari in dispute between one Parvathiah and Chandrasekhara Swamy of Balehonnur, where it has been decided that Chitaldrug Mutt is superior to that of Balehonnur. These will be produced at the time of the arguement if kindly permitted.

5th Sept 1913
Bangalore

H. V. Iswaravasaraiah
Advocate.

10

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
KADUR DISTRICT

Letter No. 1352

13: 14

Camp Kadigrupe
15th September 30th 1913.

Camp No. 1. En-3.

Dear Mr. Aravamudiengar,

As desired in your D.O. letter No. 803-Inv2: 7. 30-13 dated ... September 1913, I have had enquiries made thro' the Amildar of Koppa as regards the claim of the Inurgi matt to use Panchakalasa on the ground that it is being used by the Balehalli matt which is subordinate to it.

The Statement given by the Swamy of the Balehalli matt, Translation of an order issued by His Highness the late

12

[illegible]
12-9 1913

మేం [illegible] బాంకీపూర్ [illegible] (బీహార్) [illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 4 [illegible] 803 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Received by the Swami in
person this day.

Akhandananda

Swami

Translation of An order issued by the late Sree Krishnaraja Wadayer.

Dated Tuesday the 7th day of Jesta Bahula of the year Chitrabhanu.

Order issued to the Amcels, Killedars and Sayer Officers within the limits of the country subject to the authority of the Palace. As Panchakshari Swami of Balehalli Veeragaddigay having come to Mysore is leaving it to enquire about the religious observances &c, amongst the Sivachar people, he takes with him 1 Palakki, 1 Lena, 8 horses, 8 bulls, 2 camels, 2 weapons, 10 bovees and 40 sudra servants. You are hereby directed that where he comes to your place, you will give him a place to halt, will take care that there will be no trouble of thieves at the place he halts, supply him with food or horses and firewood for one day and also make facilities for the purchase of any other articles. You are not to obstruct him in his actions regarding the enquiries about Achara irregularities in religious observances, Basavi and Basave according to their custom. If they want coolies for wages, your are to supply them. You are to send him to the next halting place with the necessary number of servants. You should not subject him to Octrai duties.
11th June 1822.

His Highness'
signature is affixed here.

Sd/- Aswathanaraniah.

Given by the Swami of the Balehalli matte in person this day.

Balehalli matte
12-9-1913

Amildar, Koppa

15

Camp Balchimmur

12th September 1913

(Confidential)

Camp no A
Cons 3.

Respectfully submitted to the
Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

With reference to the Deputy Commissioner's memo no 437 dated the 5th September 1913, forwarding in original the confidential D.O. no 803 mis. Dy. 30-13 from the Inspector Branch of the General and Revenue Secretariat, and directing me to make secret enquiries confidentially and submit a report regarding a "Gavalkarlanna" insignia claimed by the Mysore matta at Chitaldroog, I beg to report as follows:—

I made confidential enquiries and had a personal interview on the subject with the

the Swamiji of the Badakalli mutt.
His reply in original to the points
raised in the D.O. is herewith submitted.

2. From the reply it may be seen
that the Swamiji of the Badakalli mutt
does not admit the claim of the
Amaraji mutt as its superior. The
says that the former is not subordinate
to the latter as alleged, that there
is absolutely no connection between
the 2 mutts, that the Badakalli
mutt has been in the uninterrupted
enjoyment of "Panchakalasa" insignia
and that he is not aware as to
whether or not the Amaraji mutt
is entitled to it.

3. A typed copy of the English
translation of the order said to
have been issued by His Highness in favour of the Badakalli mutt
the late Maharaja Krishnaraja Wodeyar
Bahadur III in the year Chitrabhanu,
given to me by the Swamiji for

reference and I have herewith submitted the same. The last said order, however, an amendment is made of "Commissioner".

4. The D.O. under reply is resubmitted.

Assistant.

Keeper Records.

12)

C. R. S. 26] U/1

File No. 30-13
Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to - 12 -

No. 1842 Fin 4.

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 191 .

To

Mr A K. Veerabasavaiah
and other gentlemen
of the Veerasaiva Community.

Date of issue 22-1-1914

Signed by for G. Narasimmaraja

Endorsement

With reference to their memorial dated the 14th July 1913 presented to the Dewan praying for a revision of Govt orders No. 5547-58/m7 58-97 dated 28th May 1907, and

over.

SUBJECT.

10/

5054 - 65/M.7. of 1902

Dated the 18th May 1908 declining to recognize the claim of the Swamijahs of the Murgi Matt for the honours of "Addapalke" and "Panchakalasa" respectively, W. A. K. Veerabasavaiah & other gentlemen of the Veerashaiva Community are informed that the decisions in the above cases were arrived at after anxious consideration, and that the orders issued were meant to be final that Govt. consider it quite inexpedient

~~Govt are strongly averse to~~ allow the questions to be reopened.

The enclosures to their Petitions are herewith ret.d

By order

bca

13.12.13

for Secy to Govt

14/12/13

Copied by

Examined by 20.1.

RD